DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 203 EA 016 305

AUTHOR Sistrunk, Walter E.; And Others
TITLE Investigations of Supervisory Behavior: A Symposium.
PUB DATE Nov 83
NOTE 35p.; Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Nashville, TN, November 1983).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Behavior Patterns; *Data Analysis; Data Collection; Evaluation Methods; *Questionnaires; Research Methodology; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Teacher Supervisors; Supervision; Supervisory Methods; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Schools
IDENTIFIERS Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

Two data-gathering instruments, the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) and the derivative Supervising Teacher Behavior Description Questionnaire (STBDQ), are described in one paper and employed in three others in this symposium series. Both forms are useful in evaluating perceived behaviors of supervisory educational personnel, for the forms measure whether respondents prefer supervisors to behave in a directive, collaborative, or nondirective manner in relation to specific supervisory tasks. The first paper, "Investigations of Supervisory Behavior," by Walter E. Sistrunk, describes the theoretical basis, development, characteristics, and reliability of the SBDQ, Forms 1 and 2, and the STBDQ (a modification of SBDQ, Form 2, designed specifically for supervising teachers). Form 2 yields additional data about the relationship of supervisory behaviors to teacher satisfaction and/or motivation. In the second paper, Patricia D. Sistrunk used the SBDQ, Form 1, to investigate "The Relationship between Mississippi Public Junior College Instructors' Perceptions of Supervisory Behaviors and Their Perceived Levels of Job Satisfaction." The third paper, "The Supervisory Behaviors of Secondary Vocational-Technical Center Directors," by Rebecca Love, shows a discrepancy between secondary vocational center directors' self-perception and the views of their teachers with respect to the directors' supervisory behavior. The fourth paper, "Supervising and Student Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisory Behavior," by Walter Sistrunk and James Thomson, uses the STBDQ to investigate the behaviors of supervising teachers as self-perceived and as perceived by their student teachers. A sample STBDQ is provided as an appendix. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238203

INVESTIGATIONS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR: A SYMPOSIUM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Walter E. Sistrunk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr. Walter E. Sistrunk, Professor of
Educational Leadership
Mississippi State University

Assisted by:

Dr. Rebecca O. Love
Mississippi State University

Dr. Patricia D. Sistrunk
Itawamba Junior College

Dr. James R. Thomson, Jr.
Mississippi State University

and

Dr. Herbert M. Handley
Mississippi State University

Presented at:

Mid-South Educational Research Association

Nashville, Tennessee

November 1983

EA 016 305

INVESTIGATIONS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR

By

Walter E. Sistrunk

Introduction

The series of studies discussed in this symposium began at Mississippi State in 1980. Walter Sistrunk has taught supervision almost every term for nearly 20 years. The instruments being discussed at this symposium and the research studies utilizing them, some of which are being reported today, resulted from his growing frustration with the state of the literature of instructional supervision. It has become increasing apparent that there are few, if any, complete, recognizable, generalizable theories of supervision. None of the theories known to the writer meet more than one or two of the ASCD criteria for a complete theory. All are mere fragments of theory. Examination of the research concerning supervisory practices and/or the behavior of supervisors is equally frustrating. Research conducted without a firm foundation in theory usually leads to conflicting and incomplete results. This is certainly the case of most of the research of supervisory behavior. Frustration with the literature led Sistrunk to search for better theories dealing with supervision of instruction. This search was not fruitful in terms of discovering any complete theory. However, it did lead to several fragments of theory which could serve as a basis for the development of instruments to measure supervisory behaviors. One of these areas where fragments of theory exist is the area of teacher motivation as it is influenced by supervisory behavior.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs model as a motivational theory was one

of the concepts considered. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and Sergiovanni's adaptation of it to education was the concept that ultimately became the basis for the design of the instruments. Originally, it was expected that the instruments would yield data useful in verifying McGregor's theory and Ouchi's theory. The results may still be generalizable to these theories but they have not been at this point. The concept that the conditions of work are only satisfying whereas the nature of the work is motivating/nonmotivating is part of the basic design of all three of the instruments being discussed.

These concerns led Walter Sistrunk to develop two instruments to measure the behavior of supervisors. He has since developed an instrument to measure the behavior of supervising teachers. All three instruments measure respondents' perceptions of or preferences for supervisory behavior as directive, collaborative, or nondirective. Form 2 of both the SBDQ and the STBDQ measure respondents' perceptions of each of the foregoing types of supervisory behavior as satisfying/dissatisfying and/or motivating/nonmotivating.

Development of the SBDQ, Forms 1 and 2

Walter Sistrunk developed two versions of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ). He field tested and normed both versions of the SBDQ. Form 1 of the SBDQ is composed of 53 triads of potential supervisory behavior. Each behavior is stated three ways, i.e., very directive, collaborative, and very nondirective. Form 2 of the SBDQ is composed of the same behaviors but each is stated discretely. Thus it has 159 items. It is a semantic differential instrument. Each item of Form 2 is submitted to three pairs of adjectives, i.e., pleasant/

unpleasant, satisfying/dissatisfying, and motivating/nonmotivating. Either form of the instrument may be used to determine the supervisory behaviors respondents perceive as desirable or as actually occurring. Either form of the instrument may be used to compare supervisors' perceptions to those of faculty members. Form 2 may be used to determine those behaviors deemed satisfying/dissatisfying, pleasant/unpleasant, or motivating/nonmotivating.

Each instrument yields: (1) a total score, (2) three dimensional scores (directive, collaborative, and nondirective), and (3) eight subscale scores. Each subscale score can also be made to yield the three dimensional scores (these may be the most meaningful data). Form 2 also yields semantic differentials for three pairs of adjectives and these differentials may be had for subscales.

The STBDQ, Form 1 and 2, were normed on 174 subjects by Walter Sistrunk in 1981. Sistrunk also administered the California F Scale and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to these 174 subjects. The data were analyzed through use of correlated "t" tests, canonical correlations, multiple regression, and multivariate analysis of variance. Both Form 1 and Form 2 of the SBDQ have alpha co-efficients for the total score of .90. Form 1 has an alpha for the Directive dimension of .92, .93 for the Collaborative dimension, and .89 for the Nondirective dimension. The norms for Form 2 are quite close to these. Complete data are presented later in this paper.

The first step in the development of both forms of the SBDQ was an exhaustive search of the literature to determine the task areas most common in supervision and the behaviors supervisors engage in to achieve them. Ben Harris' ten task areas served as a beginning with two others

added. These 12 task areas were presented to a panel of four doctoral students in supervision and administration, and four experienced supervisors who reduced the task areas to eight. These eight task areas comprise the eight subscales of each form of the SBDQ. The literature was also examined by this task force to discover the behaviors which are used to achieve the supervisory tasks. Over 300 behaviors were identified. A modified Delphi technique was used to reduce these to 132.

The SBDQ was developed through classification of these items under the eight subscales. Each item was stated in a very Directive way, a very Collaborative way, and Nondirective way. Form 2 utilizes the same subscales and behaviors as Form 1; but each behavior is stated discretely and five pairs of bi-polar adjectives were applied to each item. Form 1 of the SBDQ was then administered along with the California F scale to 107 graduate students at Mississippi State University. Form 2 and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were administered to 60 graduate students at Mississippi State University. Both instruments showed a high level of internal consistency and they correlated well with each other.

The Revised Instruments

Experience garnered during the first field tests of the SBDQ revealed the need to reduce the number of items of both instruments. Items not accounting for 25 percent or more of the difference were deleted after the first factor analysis. Another trial run of the data was then completed. This resulted in slightly lower alpha coefficients; but, most of them were still adequate and the alphas for the total instruments were still above .90. The instruments were

still too lengthy. This was especially true of Form 2 since it required five responses for each item and since each version of each behavior was stated discretely. Therefore, it was determined that both instruments would be substantially revised. The instruments were submitted to a panel of experts and practitioners who were given the charge of removing duplications and weak items. The senior researcher then did some editing to develop parallelism and clarity of the items. The number of items on Form 1 was reduced to 53 triads of supervisory behavior. The eight subscales were retained. Thus, Form 2 has 159 items, since each supervisory behavior is stated discretely on Form 2. The eight subscales were also retained for Form 2. The five pairs of adjective descriptors used on Form 2 were reduced to three pairs. Those kept were: satisfying/dissatisfying; pleasant/unpleasant; and, motivating/non-motivating. These changes in the SBDQ made it necessary to field-test both Forms of the instrument again.

Both Forms 1 and 2 of the revised SBDQ were administered to 104 subjects during the Fall of 1981. These 104 subjects also completed both the California F Scale and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. All subjects were graduate students at Mississippi State University, Jackson State University, and Memphis State University.

Validity and Reliability of the SBDQ, Forms 1 and 2

The construct validity was estalished for both Forms of the instrument through their firm basis in the theoretical foundations of motivation, satisfaction, and supervision. A very careful and complete examination of the literature was completed at the initial step in

developing the instruments. Utilization of two steps of the Delphi technique increased the content validity of the instruments.

Content validity was developed by use of factor analysis of both Forms. This has been done three times for Form 1 and twice for Form 2. Criterion related validity was established through canonical correlation of the two Forms with each other, correlations with the California F Scale, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, and selected demographic variables. The canonical correlations between Form 1 and Form 2 of the SBDQ yielded coefficients with each other at the .99 level and between the dimensions of: Directive, Collaborative, and Non-Directive of each instrument.

Table 1

CANONICAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN
FORM 1 AND FORM 2
OF THE SBDQ

Scale Relationships	Canonial R	Wilks Lambda	dF	Chi Square
Form 1 : Form 2 Directive	.99	.00	49	1431.98*
Form 1 : Form 2 Collaborative	.99	.00	64	9999.00*
Form 1 : Form 2 Non-Directive	.99	.00	49	956.54*

*Significant at the .05 level

The alpha coefficients for the subscales of Form 1 varied from .37 to .70 because of the small number of items. These alphas will be higher when more subjects are included in the sample.

The alpna coefficients for Form 2 are:

Total score	.91	Collaborative dimension	.89
Directive dimension	.94	Non-directive dimension	.87

The alphas for the subscale scores of Form 2 range from .79 to .93. They are higher than they are for Form 1 because each statement in each triad is stated discretely. The alpha coefficients for both instruments are depicted in the Tables which follow.

Table 2

RELIABILITY DATA FOR FORM 1 OF THE REVISED SBDQ
(ALPHA COEFFICIENTS)

Sub-Scale Scores, Dimensions and Total Scores	Alpha Coefficient
Sub-Scale 1 - Curriculum	.66
Sub-Scale 2 - Instruction	.37
Sub-Scale 3 - Staffing	.49
Sub-Scale 4 - Materials	.54
Sub-Scale 5 - Staff Development	.66
Sub-Scale 6 - Special Student Services	.67
Sub-Scale 7 - Developing Community Relations	.70
Sub-Scale 8 - Evaluation of Instruction	.70
Dimension 1 - Directive	.92
Dimension 2 - Collaborative	.93
Dimension 3 - Non-Directive	.89
Total Score - Form 1	.90

Table 3

RELIABILITY DATA FOR FORM 2 OF THE REVISED SBDQ
(ALPHA COEFFICIENTS)

Sub-Scale Scores, Dimensions and Total Scores	Alpha Coefficient
Sub-Scale 1 - Curriculum (Directive)	.87
Sub-Scale 1 - Curriculum (Non-Directive)	.81
Sub-Scale 1 - Curriculum (Collaborative)	.80
Sub-Scale 1 - Total Curriculum Development	.79
Sub-Scale 2 - Instruction (Directive)	.93
Sub-Scale 2 - Instruction (Collaborative)	.85
Sub-Scale 2 - Instruction (Non-Directive)	.81
Sub-Scale 2 - Total Organizing for Instruction	.88
Sub-Scale 3 - Staffing (Directive)	.85
Sub-Scale 3 - Staffing (Collaborative)	.83
Sub-Scale 3 - Staffing (Non-Directive)	.85
Sub-Scale 3 - Total Staffing	.89
Sub-Scale 4 - Materials (Directive)	.82
Sub-Scale 4 - Materials (Collaborative)	.84
Sub-Scale 4 - Materials (Non-Directive)	.86
Sub-Scale 4 - Total Providing Materials and Facilities	.87
Sub-Scale 5 - Staff Development (Directive)	.91
Sub-Scale 5 - Staff Development (Collaborative)	.87
Sub-Scale 5 - Staff Development (Non-Directive)	.88
Sub-Scale 5 - Total Staff Development	.92
Sub-Scale 6 - Student Services (Directive)	.86
Sub-Scale 6 - Student Services (Collaborative)	.89
Sub-Scale 6 - Student Services (Non-Directive)	.87
Sub-Scale 6 - Total Coordinating Special Student Services	.93
Sub-Scale 7 - Community Relations (Directive)	.85
Sub-Scale 7 - Community Relations (Collaborative)	.83
Sub-Scale 7 - Community Relations (Non-Directive)	.83
Sub-Scale 7 - Total Community Relations	.88
Sub-Scale 8 - Evaluation of Instruction (Directive)	.94
Sub-Scale 8 - Evaluation of Instruction (Collaborative)	.89
Sub-Scale 8 - Evaluation of Instruction (Non-Directive)	.87
Sub-Scale 8 - Total Evaluation of Instruction	.92
Total SBDQ Form 2 Scores	.91

Both Form 1 and 2 of the SBDQ are useful instruments in evaluating the perceived behaviors of educational personnel who occupy supervisory positions. Both instruments have been carefully developed from both the theoretical and the research standpoint. Validity and reliability have been established at high levels for both instruments. The two instruments correlate quite closely with each other even though respondents perceive many behaviors of supervisors as appropriate but not particularly satisfying, pleasant, or motivating. Considerable reflection upon the results of this series of studies has led to a tentative conclusion, at this point, that neither Maslow's single continuum motivational hierarchy or Herzberg's dual factor continuum of satisfaction/dissatisfaction and motivation/nonmotivation is really an adequate means of determining which supervisory behaviors will motivate teachers, if any. It appears that there is at least a third continuum and possibly a fourth that is ambient, i.e., these behaviors satisfy some people and motivate others and do neither for still others.

Either form of the SBDQ may be used to determine teachers' perceptions of supervisory behaviors or their preferences for supervisory behaviors. Either form could be used by a supervisor to evaluate the way he behaves as compared to the way the thinks he should behave. Form 2 also yields data about the relationship of supervisory behaviors to teacher satisfaction and/or motivation.

Development of the STBDQ

Walter Sistrunk and James Thomson modified Form 2 of the SBDQ in 1983 for use in measuring the behaviors of supervising teachers. The STBDQ, Form 2, is a semantic differential similar to Form 2 of the SBDQ, from which it was derived. The STBDQ consists of 54 discrete items. It yields a total score, three subscale scores, three dimensional scores, and dimensional scores within each subscale. The STBDQ, Form 2 was administered to 132 student teachers and 95 supervising teachers (total= 227) along with the California F Scale. Thomson will discuss the findings in his presentation. The instrument had the following alpha coefficients:

Total score	.97
Directive dimension	.95
Collaborative dimension	.95
Nondirective dimension	.96
Subscale 1 - Planning and organizing	.88
Subscale 2 - Instructional Management	.94
Subscale 3 - Instructional Evaluation	.93

These data indicate high degree of cohesiveness of the instrument.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Presented by:

Patricia Dornbusch Sistrunk, Instructor
Itawamba Junior College

Presented at:

The Annual Conference of The
Mid-South Educational Research Association

Nashville, Tennessee

November 1983

This study investigated the relationships between junior college academic instructors' perceptions of existing supervisory behaviors at their institution and their perceived levels of job satisfaction. It is one of the series of studies of supervisory behavior at Mississippi State University.

The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ), Form 1, and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (Cooper's modification for junior colleges) were used to gather the data. The population consisted of 729 full-time academic instructors at Mississippi's 16 public junior colleges. The sample consisted of the 452 persons who completed and returned both instruments. The sample consisted of 62% of the population. A step-wise multiple regression program was used to analyze the data.

The SBDQ yielded a total score, three dimensional scores, and eight subscale scores. The subscale scores were not used in this study. The PTO yielded 10 factor scores and a total score. The analyses of the data revealed significant positive relationships between (1) the total SBDQ score and the PTO Factor, Curriculum Issues, (2) the SBDQ Directive dimension score and the PTO Factor, Teacher-Supervisor Rapport, and (3) the SBDQ Nondirective dimension score and the PTO Factors: Teacher-Supervisor Rapport, Curriculum Issues, and Community Pressures. Further analysis of the data revealed significant negative relationships between (1) the SBDQ Directive dimension score and the PTO Factors: Curriculum Issues and Satisfaction with Teaching, (2) the SBDQ Collaborative dimension score and the PTO Factors: Teacher-Supervisor Rapport, Curriculum Issues, and Community Pressures. Final analysis of the data revealed

significant positive relationship between (1) the SBDQ Total Score and the PTO total score, (2) the SBDQ Directive dimension score and the PTO total score and (3) the SBDQ Nondirective dimension score and the PTO total score when the demographic variables of age, race, sex, degree held, present or previous supervisory experience, area of specialization, and experience were considered. There was a significant negative relationship between the SBDQ Collaborative dimension score and the PTO total score when the demographic variables were considered. When the demographic variables were considered discretely, only race accounted for a significant amount of the variance between the SBDQ total score and each of the dimensions and the PTO total score.

The findings of this study indicated that the job satisfaction of males and caucasians is not as dependent upon supervisory structure and/or direction as is that of females and noncaucasians. This may mean that male caucasians are more accustomed to lack of structure or it may mean they are more tolerant of it.

These findings tend to agree with those of earlier studies completed by Walter Sistrunk; Phipps; Lucht, Moss and W. Sistrunk; Bowen (Love); and Hooper. While, none of the foregoing studies correlated supervisory behavior with job satisfaction, they did correlate it with Tennessee Self-Concept Scale scores, California F Scale scores, or both. These studies revealed strong preferences (or perceptions) of directive supervisory behavior except for the subscales of Curriculum Development and Instructional Evaluation where the preference was for collaborative supervisory behavior. Other than in those two areas, a stronger preference for, or perception of, directive supervisory behavior was re-

vealed by females and noncaucasians. Hooper's study did not use the SBDQ, rather it used the Maslach Teacher Burnout Inventory, but it dealt with many perceptions similar to those revealed by the SBDQ.

There is a need to use the SBDQ, Form 2, to determine the perceptions of respondents of those supervisory behaviors which are deemed motivating, those deemed merely satisfying, and those that are deemed neither satisfying nor motivating. It is not quite clear what the relationship is between instructors' job satisfaction and their motivation to do better work. Thus, the theories of Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg and Sergiovanni still need further empirical investigation.

Table 1

Relationships Between Levels of Authoritarianism and Perceptions of Supervising Teacher Behaviors

STBDQ Subscales	Canonical R	df	Chi Square
Instructional Planning	.13	3	3.85
Instructional Management	.19	3	7.94*
Instructional Evaluation	.21	3	9.83*
Total Score	.20	3	8.85*

Table 2

Relationship of Levels of Authoritarianism and the Dimensions of Supervisory Teacher Behaviors

Variables	Total Score	Instructional Management	Instructional Evaluation
Directive	-.85	-.69	-.77
Collaborative	.62	.75	.63
Nondirective	.07	-.14	.12

Table 3

Comparison of Dimensions of Supervising Teacher Behavior as Perceived by Student Teachers and Supervising Teachers

Scale	Dimensions	Supervising Teachers (N=57)	Student Teachers (N=168)	F
Instructional Planning	Directive	9.67	9.83	.08
Instructional Planning	Collaborative	2.07	2.05	.00
Instructional Planning	Nondirective	6.08	5.29	1.46
Instructional Management	Directive	9.77	9.27	2.74
Instructional Management	Collaborative	2.65	2.13	1.49
Instructional Management	Nondirective	8.89	7.12	3.81
Evaluation	Directive	10.88	11.50	.46
Evaluation	Collaborative	2.32	1.90	.83
Evaluation	Nondirective	12.74	10.73	3.68
Total	Directive	30.32	30.61	.02
Total	Collaborative	7.04	6.08	.93
Total	Nondirective	27.72	23.14	3.92*

Table 4

Comparison of Preference for Dimensions of Supervising Teachers as Perceived by Supervising Teachers

Variable	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Directive	30.32	15.39	10.17*
Collaborative	7.04	6.53	
Directive	30.32	15.39	1.28
Nondirective	27.72	16.46	
Collaborative	7.03	6.53	-8.84*
Nondirective	27.72	16.46	
Inst Planning Directive	9.67	3.95	12.77*
Inst Planning Collab	2.07	2.28	
Inst Planning Directive	9.67	3.95	5.53*
Inst Planning Nondirect	6.09	4.66	
Inst Planning Collab	2.07	2.28	-5.42*
Inst Planning Nondirect	6.09	4.66	
Inst Manage Directive	9.77	6.90	7.24*
Inst Manage Collab	2.65	2.84	
Inst Manage Collab	2.65	2.84	-6.68*
Inst Manage Nondirect	8.89	6.60	
Inst Manage Directive	9.77	6.90	1.17
Inst Manage Nondirect	8.89	6.60	
Evaluation Directive	10.88	6.40	9.20
Evaluation Collab	2.32	2.97	
Evaluation Directive	10.88	6.40	-1.91
Evaluation Nondirect	12.74	6.96	
Evaluation Collab	2.32	2.97	-10.85*
Evaluation Nondirect	12.74	6.96	

Table 5

Comparison of Preference for Dimensions of Supervising Teachers as Perceived by Student Teachers

Variables	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
Directive	30.61	13.88	22.03*
Collaborative	6.08	6.43	
Directive	30.61	13.88	5.69*
Nondirective	23.14	14.61	
Collaborative	6.08	6.43	-14.15*
Nondirective	23.14	14.61	
Inst Planning Directive	9.83	3.73	24.85*
Inst Planning Collab	2.05	2.40	
Inst Planning Directive	9.83	3.74	11.20*
Inst Planning Nondirect	5.29	4.17	
Inst Planning Collab	2.05	2.40	-9.10*
Inst Planning Nondirect	5.29	4.17	
Inst Manag Directive	9.27	5.97	15.25*
Inst Manag Collab	2.13	2.75	
Inst Manag Directive	9.27	5.97	4.25*
Inst Manag Nondirect	7.12	5.70	
Inst Manag Collab	2.13	2.75	-10.48*
Inst Manag Nondirect	7.12	5.70	
Evaluation Directive	11.50	5.84	18.67*
Evaluation Collab	1.90	2.99	
Evaluation Directive	11.50	5.84	1.32
Evaluation Nondirect	10.73	6.79	
Evaluation Collab	1.90	2.99	-15.70*
Evaluation Nondirect	10.73	6.79	

THE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS OF SECONDARY, VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER DIRECTORS

Presented by:

Rebecca O. Love,
Research and Curriculum Specialist
Field Services at The Research and Curriculum Unit
for Vocational-Technical Education
Mississippi State University

Presented at:

The Annual Conference of The
Mid-South Educational Research Association

Nashville, Tennessee

November 1983

Problem

The study was an effort to determine the supervisory behaviors of secondary vocational-technical center directors as self-perceived and as perceived by selected faculty members.

Population Studied

The population studied consisted of all the secondary vocational-technical center directors and three teachers (academic, trade and remedial) in each center. There were 69 directors, 64 academic teachers (defined as business education or distributive education), 67 trade instructors (defined as building trades or auto mechanics), and 35 remedial instructors. The participants were in attendance at a state-wide summer vocational education conference on the Mississippi State University campus.

Results

1. Vocational-technical center teachers perceived supervisory practices as less directive than did vocational-technical center administrators.

2. Respondents in vocational-technical centers located on high school campuses perceived supervisory practices as more directive than other respondents.

3. Teachers and directors with previous supervisory experience perceived supervisory practices as more directive than did teachers and directors without previous supervisory experience.

4. Remedial teachers perceived supervisory behaviors as more non-directive than did academic or trade teachers.

5. Educators in centers employing a staff larger than 12 people perceived supervisory practices as more collaborative than did educators in smaller centers.

6. Teachers and administrators over 56 years of age perceived supervisory practices as more collaborative than younger respondents did.

7. Respondents holding degrees higher than a Masters' perceived supervisory practices as more directive than those holding degrees below that level.

8. Years of teaching experience as a variable did not relate to perceived supervisory behaviors.

Interpretation

Considerable difference was evidenced in the perceptions held by administrators and teachers concerning the supervisory practices in vocational-technical centers. If productive work is to be fostered, an effort should be made to resolve these differences.

The difference in the individual view of the administrative role may account for the directors' perception of their practices as more directive than it was perceived by the teachers. The view of teachers at centers located on high school campuses of more directive supervisory practices could be due to the proximity of another administrator; it is also possible that the proximity of another administrator alters the behavior of the vocational-technical administrator.

Teachers and directors with previous supervisory experience may be more sensitive to supervisory practices and thus perceive them as more directive than those teachers and directors without previous supervisory experience. The possibility also exists that these individuals may require more directive supervision.

In order to be located near the office of the guidance counselor, remedial teachers are often housed in offices or rooms adjoining the administrative office of the vocational director. This fact could contribute to th perception of supervisory practices as more non-directive by remedial teachers than by academic or trade teachers. Many of the tasks assigned to the other vocational teachers do not pertain to the role of the remedial teacher, and this could also account for their perception.

The larger vocational staff may require more collaborative supervisory practices than smaller staffs, because of time and resource restrictions. Teachers and administrators over 56 years of age may perceive supervisory practices as more collaborative than the younger respondents because they may be called on for advice due to their age or experience in the work setting.

Teachers or administrators holding degrees beyond the Masters' Degree may have perceived supervisory practices as more directive because of an unfulfilled need to have a voice in the supervisory practices at the center. Another possibility is that these people are perceptive of what constitutes directive behavior in supervision.

SUPERVISING AND STUDENT TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS

Presented by:

Walter E. Sistrunk
Mississippi State University

and

James R. Thomson
Mississippi State University

Presented at:

Mid-South Educational Research Association

November 1983

Introduction

This study was an investigation of the supervisory behaviors of supervising teachers as self-perceived and as perceived by student teachers. The problem was to determine: (a) the supervising teacher behaviors which respondents perceived as satisfying/dissatisfying, pleasant/unpleasant, and/or motivating/nonmotivating; and, (b) the relationships of these perceptions to respondents' California F Scale scores and to their levels of assignment.

The Instrument

The instrument used to collect the data about supervisory behavior was the Supervising Teacher Behavior Description Questionnaire (STBDQ), Form 2. This instrument was developed by modifying certain items of the SBDQ (Form 2) for use with supervising teachers and student teachers. It is composed of 54 discrete items. Each item is subjected to a choice of three pairs of adjective descriptors. The instrument yields a total score, three subscale scores, and three dimensional scores.

Procedures

The STBDQ and the California F Scale were administered to 168 student teachers and 57 supervising teachers at Mississippi State University in the spring of 1983. Validity and reliability of the instrument were determined and were reported earlier by Sistrunk in this symposium.

The data were analyzed by use of canonical correlations, corre-

lated "t"s, analysis of variance and other statistics. Tables are not included in this paper but were attached to a more complete paper presented at a discussion session at this conference.

Findings

A positive relationship was found between levels of authoritarianism and respondents' perceptions of supervising teacher behavior. These relationships were significant for the subscales of Instructional Management and Instructional Evaluation. They were also significant for the total STBDQ score. They were not significant for the subscale of Instructional Planning.

When the dimensions of the STBDQ were considered along with levels of authoritarianism, it was found that negative relationships existed for the Directive dimension on both subscales and the total score. Positive relationships existed for the Collaborative dimension on both subscales and the total score. Positive correlations were found for the Nondirective dimension as it related to the total score and Instructional Evaluation and a negative correlation as it related to Instructional Management. The correlation for the subscale of Instructional Planning was not significant.

Student teachers preferred their supervising teachers be directive rather than collaborative in the subscale of Instructional Planning when only those two dimensions were compared. They preferred direction to nondirection when only those two dimensions were compared within the subscale of Instructional Planning. Student teachers preferred collaboration to nondirection when only those two dimensions were compared within the subscale of Instructional Planning.

When the subscale of Instructional Management was considered, the student teachers preferred the Directive dimension to the Collaborative, the Directive to the Nondirective, and the Nondirective to the Collaborative. The student teachers reported similar preferences when the subscale of Instructional Evaluation was considered.

Supervising teachers reported a preference for the Directive dimension over the Collaborative, the Directive over the Nondirective (not significant), and the Collaborative over the Nondirective when the total score of the STBDQ was considered. When the subscale of Instructional Management was considered, they indicated a preference for Collaboration over Direction, Direction over Nondirection, and Nondirection over Collaboration. Supervising teachers reported a preference for Direction over Collaboration, Collaboration over Nondirection, and Direction over Nondirection (not significant, when the subscale of Instructional Management was considered). Supervising teachers reported a preference for Direction over Collaboration in the area of Instructional Evaluation. They also reported nonsignificant preferences for Direction over Nondirection and Collaborative over Nondirective.

Both student teachers and supervising teachers reported preference for the Directive dimension over the Collaborative dimension. The supervising teachers favored Direction over Nondirection, whereas the student teachers reported a significant preference for Nondirection over Direction for the total STBDQ. Student teachers also reported greater preference for Nondirection over Collaboration than supervising teachers for the total STBDQ.

When the subscale of Instructional Planning was considered, the two groups did not report significantly different preferences for supervising teacher behavior. When the subscale of Instructional Management was considered, the two groups differed, as they did on the subscale of Instructional Evaluation. These differences were significant in most cases. Thus, it can be seen that the expectations of the supervising teachers and the student teachers differ in important ways.

Copyright applied for 11/1/83

SUPERVISING TEACHER BEHAVIOR

DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (STBDQ) FORM 2

1. The supervising teacher should write and plan units and lessons for the student teaching experience.

2. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in writing and planning units and lessons.

3. The supervising teacher snould permit the student teacher to plan and write his/her own units and lessons.

4. The supervising teacher should determine the educational objectives and how they are to be achieved.

5. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in determining the educational objectives and how they are to be achieved.

6. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to determine the educational objectives and how they are to be achieved.

7. The supervising teacher should group students within tne classroom for instructional purposes.

8. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in grouping students within the classroom for instructional purposes.

9. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to group students within the classroom for instructional purposes.

10. The supervising teacher should tell and/or show the student teacher how to improve students' study and work habits.

11. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in telling and/or showing the students how to improve their study and work habits.

12. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to tell and/or show the students how to improve their study and work habits.

13. The supervising teacher should require standard procedures and format of unit and lesson plans.

Copyright applied for 11/1/83

14. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in developing standard unit and lesson plans.

15. The supervising teacher should permit student teachers to develop standard unit and lesson plans.

16. The supervising teacher should show the student teacher how to use machines and materials.

17. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in learning how to use machines and materials.

18. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to learn how to use machines and materials.

19. The supervising teacher should assign specific instructional tasks to the student teacher.

20. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the supervising teacher in the choice of instructional tasks.

21. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to select his/her own instructional tasks.

22. The supervising teacher should preview and select curricular materials prior to their use by the student teacher.

23. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in previewing and selecting curricular materials prior to their use by the student teacher.

24. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to preview and select his/her own curricular material.

25. The supervising teacher should decide if curricular materials are contributing to the desired educational objectives.

26. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in deciding if curricular materials are contributing to the desired educational objectives.

27. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to decide if curricular materials are contributing to the desired educational objectives.

28. The supervising teacher should determine the areas of improvement needed by the student teacher and tells/shows him/her how to improve.

Copyright applied for 11/1/83

29. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in determining the areas of improvement needed by the student teacher and the means of improving.

30. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to determine the areas of improvement needed by the student teacher and how to improve.

31. The supervising teacher should provide a framework for implementation of educational innovations by the student teacher.

32. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in providing frameworks for the implementation of educational innovations by the student teacher.

33. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to devise frameworks for implementing educational innovations in his/her classes.

34. The supervising teacher should identify instructional problems encountered by the student teacher.

35. The supervising teacher should collaborate with the student teacher in identifying instructional problems encountered by the student teachers.

36. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to identify his/her instructional problems.

37. The supervising teacher should require the student teacher to develop written long range instructional plans.

38. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in tne development of long range written instructional plans.

39. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to develop long range written instructional plans.

40. The supervising teacher should establish objectives and procedures for evaluating the student teacher's instruction.

41. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in establishing objectives and procedures for evaluating the student teacher's instruction.

42. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to establish objectives and procedures for evaluating his/her instruction.

Copyright applied for 11/1/83

43. The supervising teacher should base the evaluation of the student teacher's progress on research.

44. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in developing research based criteria for evaluating the student teacher's progress.

45. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to develop research based criteria for evaluating student teacher progress.

46. The supervising teacher should tell/show the student teacher how to teach more effectively.

47. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in determining how the student teacher can teach more effectively.

48. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to determine how he/she can teach more effectively.

49. The supervising teacher should select instruments for evaluating student teacher progress.

50. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in selecting instruments for evaluating student teacher progress.

51. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to select instruments for evaluating student teacher progress.

52. The supervising teacher should conduct action research about teaching on a regular basis.

53. The supervising teacher and the student teacher should collaborate in conducting action research about teaching on a regular basis.

54. The supervising teacher should permit the student teacher to conduct action research about teaching on a regular basis.

REFERENCES

Behling, Orlando; Labovitz, George; and Kosmo, Richard. "The Herberg Controversy: A Critical Reappraisal." Academy of Management Journal, March 1968, pp. 99-108.

Bennis, Warren G.; Schein, Edgar H. and McGregor, Caroline, Editors. Leadership and Motivation: Essays of Douglas McGregor. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Blackbourn, Richard. "The Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisory Behaviors and Their Attitudes Toward the Supervisory Conference Following Classroom Observation." Unpublishe Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1983.

Friedlander, Frank. "Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers." Journal of Applied Psychology 48 (1964): 388-392.

Herzberg, Frederick. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees," Motivation and Management of People Chapter 22.

Herzberg, Frederick. The Managerial Choice: To Be Efficient and To Be Human. Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1976.

House, Robert J. and Wigdor, Lawrence A. "Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism." Personnel Psychology 20 (1967): 370.

Hoy, Wayne K. and Miskel, Cecil G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Kosmo, Richard and Behling, Orlando. "Single Continuum Job Satisfaction vs. Duality: An Empirical Test." Personnel Psychology 20 (1967): 327-334.

Love, Rebecca O. "Supervisory Behaviors of Secondary Vocational-Technical Center Directors as Self-Perceived and as Perceived by Selected Faculty Members." Unpublished Dissertation, Misissippi State University, 1982.

McClelland, David C. "Money As A Motivator: Some Research Insights," Motivation and Management of People Chapter 21.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1960.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Journal of Educational Administration 5 (May 1967), pp. 66-82.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Elliott, David L. Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., Editor. Supervision of Teaching, 1982 ASCD Yearbook.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Carver, Fred D. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, Inc., 1973.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision, Human Perspectives, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Sistrunk, Patricia D. "The Relationship Between Mississippi Public Junior College Instructors' Perceptions of Supervisory Behavior and Their Perceived Levels of Job Satisfaction." Unpublished Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1982.

Sistrunk, Walter E. "The Development of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Forms 1, and 2." Presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association annual conference, November 1981, Lexington, Kentucky.

Sistrunk, Walter E. "The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, (SBDQ) Forms 1 and 2 as Research Instruments." Presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association annual conference, November 1982, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Terpstra, David E. "Theories of Motivation: Borrowing the Best." Personnel Journal 58 (July 1979): 377.